

Amendment and Response

Applicant: John M. Hall

Serial No.: 09/810,281

Filed: March 15, 2001

Docket No.: 10004375-1

Title: NETWORK SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING USER-RELATIVE ADDRESSING

REMARKS

The following remarks are made response to the Office Action mailed July 16, 2004. In that Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 14, 15, 18, 19, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Agraharam et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,987,508 ("Agraharam"). Claims 7-10, 16, 17, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Agraharam in view of Takahashi, U.S. Patent No. 6,442,589 ("Takahashi"). Claims 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weik, U.S. Patent No. 6,587,540 ("Weik") in view of McDowell et al., U.S. patent No. 6,438,583 ("McDowell").

With this Response, claims 1 and 14 have been amended. Claims 1-21 remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner stated that "Claim 1 recites the limitation 'said second client' in claim 1, line 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim." (Office Action at page 2). In the copy of the claims reviewed by Applicant, there is not a limitation "said second client" appearing in claim 1, and this claim is only 10 lines in length, so there is no line 16 as cited by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 1 under U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 14, 15, 18, 19, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Agraharam et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,987,508 ("Agraharam"). Independent claims 1 and 14, as amended herein, include the limitations "receiving user identification information identifying a **sender** of the communication" and "determining a first absolute destination for the communication based on the first action and the user identification information." (emphasis added). Agraharam does not teach or suggest determining an absolute destination for a communication based on user identification information that identifies a **sender** of the communication, as recited in independent claims 1 and 14. Agraharam discloses the use of an alias email address that consists of a recipient's

Amendment and Response

Applicant: John M. Hall

Serial No.: 09/810,281

Filed: March 15, 2001

Docket No.: 10004375-1

Title: NETWORK SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING USER-RELATIVE ADDRESSING

telephone number. (See, e.g., Agraharam at col. 1, lines 44-46). A message addressed to that alias email address is translated by a translation server to the actual email address for the recipient. (See, e.g., Agraharam at col. 1, lines 52-55). Agraharam determines the actual email address based on the received alias email address. (Agraharam at col. 1, lines 59-63). Both the actual email address and the alias email address relate to the **recipient**. (Agraharam at col. 1, lines 59-63). There is no teaching or suggestion in Agraharam that the actual email address is determined based on a **sender** of the email.

In view of the above, Agraharam does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claim 1 or independent claim 14. The Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claims 1 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), and requests allowance of these claims. Since dependent claims 2-6 and 15 further limit patentably distinct claim 1 or claim 14, claims 2-6 and 15 are believed to be allowable over the cited reference, and allowance of claims 2-6 and 15 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 18 includes the limitations “accessing a **sender** record based on the received **sender** identification information”, “identifying a first attribute in the **sender** record”, and “determining a first absolute destination based on the first attribute.” (emphasis added). As described above with respect to claims 1 and 14, Agraharam does not teach or suggest determining an absolute destination for a communication based on user identification information that identifies a **sender** of the communication, as recited in independent claims 1 and 14. Rather, both the actual email address and the alias email address disclosed in Agraharam relate to the **recipient**, and there is no teaching or suggestion in Agraharam that the actual email address is determined based on a **sender** of the email. For the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 14, Agraharam also does not teach or suggest “accessing a **sender** record based on the received **sender** identification information”, “identifying a first attribute in the **sender** record”, and “determining a first absolute destination based on the first attribute” as recited in independent claim 18.

In view of the above, Agraharam does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claim 18. The Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), and requests allowance of this claim. Since dependent claims 19 and 21 further limit patentably distinct claim 18, claims 19 and 21 are believed to

Amendment and Response

Applicant: John M. Hall

Serial No.: 09/810,281

Filed: March 15, 2001

Docket No.: 10004375-1

Title: NETWORK SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING USER-RELATIVE ADDRESSING

be allowable over the cited reference, and allowance of claims 19 and 21 is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 7-10, 16, 17, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Agraharam in view of Takahashi, U.S. Patent No. 6,442,589 ("Takahashi"). Claims 7-10 are dependent on independent claim 1. Claims 16 and 17 are dependent on independent claim 14. Claim 20 is dependent on independent claim 18. As described above with respect to claims 1 and 14, Agraharam does not teach or suggest "receiving user identification information identifying a **sender** of the communication" and "determining a first absolute destination for the communication based on the first action and the user identification information", as recited in claims 1 and 14. (emphasis added). As described above with respect to claim 18, Agraharam does not teach or suggest "accessing a **sender** record based on the received **sender** identification information", "identifying a first attribute in the **sender** record", and "determining a first absolute destination based on the first attribute", as recited in claim 18. (emphasis added). Takahashi also does not teach or suggest these limitations of claims 1, 14, and 18.

In view of the above, Agraharam and Takashi, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of dependent claims 7-10, 16, 17, and 20. Since dependent claims 7-10, 16, 17, and 20 further limit patentably distinct claim 1, 14, or 18, claims 7-10, 16, 17, and 20 are believed to be allowable over the cited references, and allowance of claims 7-10, 16, 17, and 20 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weik, U.S. Patent No. 6,587,540 ("Weik") in view of McDowell et al., U.S. patent No. 6,438,583 ("McDowell"). Independent claim 11 includes the limitations "a controller coupled to the receiver and the memory, the controller configured to: identify whether the destination information specifies a sender-relative destination; perform at least one search of the directory server based on the stored search information and the sender identification information if the destination information specifies a sender-relative destination; and identify at least one absolute destination based on the search." The Examiner indicated that Weik discloses at column 2, lines 37-44, a controller configured to identify whether destination

Amendment and Response

Applicant: John M. Hall

Serial No.: 09/810,281

Filed: March 15, 2001

Docket No.: 10004375-1

Title: NETWORK SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING USER-RELATIVE ADDRESSING

information in a received communication specifies a sender-relative destination. (Office Action at page 8). Weik, at column 2, lines 37-44, discloses that sender-specific data of an incoming email can be used in pre-sorting the email. Weik does not teach or suggest identifying whether this sender-specific data specifies a sender-relative destination. There is no teaching or suggestion in Weik regarding sender-relative destinations, or looking at destination information in a communication and determining the type of destination information specified (e.g., sender-relative or absolute). McDowell also does not teach or suggest a controller configured to identify whether destination information in a received communication specifies a sender-relative destination.

The Examiner indicated that Weik discloses at column 2, lines 44-61, a controller configured to perform at least one search of a directory server based on the stored search information and the sender identification information if the destination information specifies a sender-relative destination. (Office Action at page 8). The Examiner acknowledged, however, that “[t]he Weik reference does not explicitly state a directory server.” (Office Action at page 8). Weik, at column 2, lines 44-61, discloses that sender specific data are compared with either a black list or a white list. There is no teaching or suggestion in Weik regarding searching a directory server, let alone searching a directory server based on stored search information [that identifies searches associated with sender-relative destinations] and sender identification information, as recited in claim 11. The Examiner stated that “[t]he McDowell references teaches LDAP with a directory server (McDowell: col. 6, lines 12-18; Figure 12)”. (Office Action at page 8). However, there is no teaching or suggestion in McDowell that the directory server is searched based on stored search information [that identifies searches associated with sender-relative destinations] and sender identification information, as recited in claim 11.

The Examiner indicated that Weik discloses at column 2, lines 62-66, a controller configured to identify at least one absolute destination based on the search. As described above, there is no teaching or suggestion in Weik regarding searching a directory server. If no such search is taught or suggested, it logically follows that Weik also does not teach or suggest identifying at least one absolute destination based on such a search. Weik, at column 2, lines 62-66, discloses that if the result of the comparison with the white list is positive, a backup copy of the email is stored. This cited portion of Weik does not teach or suggest

Amendment and Response

Applicant: John M. Hall

Serial No.: 09/810,281

Filed: March 15, 2001

Docket No.: 10004375-1

Title: NETWORK SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING USER-RELATIVE ADDRESSING

identifying at least one absolute destination based on a search of a directory server. As described above, there is also no teaching or suggestion in McDowell that a directory server is searched based on stored search information [that identifies searches associated with sender-relative destinations] and sender identification information. If no such search is taught or suggested, it logically follows that McDowell also does not teach or suggest identifying at least one absolute destination based on such a search.

In view of the above, Weik and McDowell, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claim 11. The Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and requests allowance of this claim. Since dependent claims 12 and 13 further limit patentably distinct claim 11, claims 12 and 13 are believed to be allowable over the cited references, and allowance of claims 12 and 13 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-21 are in form for allowance and are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-21 is respectfully requested.

No fees are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16(b)(c). However, if such fees are required, the Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's representative at the below-listed telephone numbers to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to either James R. McDaniel at Telephone No. (208) 396-4095, Facsimile No. (208) 396-3958 or Jeff A. Holmen at Telephone No. (612) 573-0178, Facsimile No. (612) 573-2005. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Amendment and Response

Applicant: John M. Hall

Serial No.: 09/810,281

Filed: March 15, 2001

Docket No.: 10004375-1

Title: NETWORK SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING USER-RELATIVE ADDRESSING



Hewlett-Packard Company

Intellectual Property Administration

P.O. Box 272400

Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

John M. Hall,

By his attorneys,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC

Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250

100 South Fifth Street

Minneapolis, MN 55402

Telephone: (612) 573-0178

Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: 10/14/04
JAH:jmc

Jeff A. Holmen
Jeff A. Holmen
Reg. No. 38,492

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8:

The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being deposited in the United States Postal Service, as first class mail, in an envelope address to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 14th day of October, 2004.

By Jeff A. Holmen
Name: Jeff A. Holmen